

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 11, 13, and 25 through 30 are pending, with Claims 1, 13, 28, and 30 being independent. Claims 1, 13, and 26-30 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

The specification has been amended to correct a translation error in the title of a background article at page 2. No new matter has been added.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35.U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have amended Claim 29 to change its dependency from Claim 27 to 28, and submit that the claim as amended is fully supported by the original disclosure. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested.

Claim 29 was objected to because of the following informality: “. . .said controller . . .” should read “. . . a controller . . .”. Applicants submit that the amendment to the dependency of Claim 29 obviates this objection.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 13 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Osaka et al. Claims 3-4, 11 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the feature generating 3D image reproduction data for a 3D display apparatus that forms

intersections of a plurality of rays in the air, wherein the intersections of rays are recognized as a 3D image by an observer. In other words, a plurality of rays are generated that cross at intersections, and the resulting intersections of the rays form a contour of a projected image that an observer can recognize as a 3D image. The other independent claims recite similar features.

Applicants submit that the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features. Neither Osaka nor Ishikawa discloses generation of 3D object images. Osaka discloses the use of a stereoscopic display principle based upon a crossed-lenticular scheme. In that reference, left and right parallax images are observed upon being separated by a lenticular lens for viewing by both eyes of a user so that the user recognizes 3D object images. Since the left and right images are separated, there are not intersections of rays that are recognized as a 3D image by an observer.

The Office Action refers to the intersections of rays in Fig. 22B of Osaka. However, those rays are not generated such that the intersections can be recognized as a 3D object. Instead, Fig. 22A merely shows that irradiated rays from a backlight 3 are directed at an observer's right eye (ER) and Fig. 22B shows that the irradiated rays from the backlight 3 are directed through LCD display 1, which displays a left parallax image, at an observer's left eye (EL). Thus, as shown in Fig. 24, Osaka merely discloses the combining of the right parallax image R for the right eye of the observer and the left parallax image L for the left eye of the observer, which the observer sees on LCD display 1, so that the observer recognizes a 3D image. It is the images on the display that the observer recognizes as a 3D image, not the intersections of a plurality of rays in the air.

In Ishikawa, a stereoscopic display with a lenticular lens or liquid crystal shutter spectacles is used to generate 3D object images. Again, intersections of rays are not recognized as a 3D image.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention recited in Claims 1, 13, 28, and 30 is patentable over the art of record, whether that art is considered individually or in combination.

The dependent claims are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the above-mentioned objection and rejections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Brian L. Klock

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/lmj

DC_MAIN 184134v1